

Appl. No. : 09/555,951
Filed : September 5, 2000

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections in view of the following remarks, and to pass Claims 23-44 to allowance.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings asserting that “they fail to show details at the boxes described on FIG. 1 as described in the specification.” Applicants believe the Examiner requests that the boxes be labeled. (If Applicants’ understanding is incorrect, Applicants request clarification.) Accordingly, Figure 1 has been amended by adding labels to the boxes as set forth in the attached document entitled “SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED DRAWING AMENDMENTS FOR APPROVAL BY EXAMINER”. In view of amended Figure 1, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the drawings.

Rejection of Claim 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejects **Claim 35** as being anticipated by Hulen (U.S. Patent No. 5,497,373). The Examiner asserts that Hulen teaches each and every limitation recited in **Claim 35**. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assertions for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

Hulen does not disclose a method of providing a mailbox answerphone service to a caller in a mobile communications system during a call directed to a directory number used commonly by different subscribers to access their mailboxes. In fact, Hulen explicitly disclaims teaching mailbox answerphone services: “The host messaging center includes the necessary data processing hardware, software, and mass storage for providing various multi-media communications services. However, since the host messaging center 14 is not the focus of the present invention, its internal architecture and operation are not described in further detail.” (Column 6, lines 3-9.) (Emphasis added.)

Instead of mailbox answerphone services, Hulen discloses a multi-media interface for protocol conversions corresponding to various types of telecommunications media. For example, Hulen’s Figure 1 shows the multi-media interface (MMI) 12 in communications with the host

Appl. No. : 09/555,951
Filed : September 5, 2000

messaging center 14 that provides messaging services, but is not described in further detail. The multi-media interface 12 performs protocol interfacing, e.g., converts logarithmically encoded PCM (A-law or μ -law) data into a compressed standard data format processable by the host 14, and expands the compressed data into log-PCM form for transmission back to the subscriber over the telephony network. (Column 5, lines 40-45.)

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Hulen discloses a technology that is different from the technology defined in the present claims, for example, **Claim 35**. Accordingly, Hulen does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 35**.

For example, Hulen does not disclose or suggest identifying, through an answerphone service, a mailbox associated with a subscriber identification code. Hulen describes protocol processing, but not a subscriber's mailbox associated with a subscriber's ID. For example, Hulen's MMI CPU 48 converts a service map into a corresponding service table shown in Figure 3(b) which is used by the CPU 48 to configure the various hardware in the MMI 12 to handle a caller's time slot. (Column 7, lines 45-55.) Further, the MMI CPU 48 uses a unique service ID, which indicates one or more service protocols selected for a particular channel ID, in conjunction with other service table entries to allocate and configure the software service port (DSP) to perform the appropriate protocol conversion processing. (Column 8, lines 28-33.) Thus, Hulen describes channel IDs and service IDs, but not a subscriber's identification code.

Further, Hulen does not disclose or suggest automatically entering either a first mode of answerphone operation if the call is of national origin or a second, different mode of answerphone operation if the call is of international origin. Applicants have reviewed the specification of Hulen to which the Examiner cites (column 8, line 63 to column 9, line 9) and note that Hulen's CPU identifies the appropriate DSPs/service ports to perform one or more corresponding service protocols. However, Hulen does not disclose differentiation if the call is of international origin. In fact, the Examiner already recognizes this in the Office Action (cf., page 4, last sentence, of the Office Action).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen fails to disclose or to suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 35**. Therefore, Hulen does not anticipate **Claim 35**. Further, in view of Hulen's failure to disclose a method of providing a mailbox

Appl. No. : 09/555,951
Filed : September 5, 2000

answerphone service to a caller in a mobile communications system, and the steps of identifying and automatically entering, as recited in **Claim 35**, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen does not render the subject matter of **Claim 35** obvious. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of **Claim 35** and to pass **Claim 35** to allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 23-34

The Examiner rejects independent **Claim 23** and dependent **Claims 24-28 and 31-34** as being unpatentable over Hulen in view of Wilson (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,772). Further, the Examiner rejects dependent **Claims 29 and 30** as being unpatentable over Hulen in view of Wilson and further in view of Kennedy (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,810).

As to independent **Claim 23**, the Examiner asserts that Hulen discloses a method of providing a mailbox answerphone service to a caller in a mobile communications system during a call directed to a directory number used commonly by different subscribers to access their mailboxes. Further, the Examiner asserts that Hulen discloses the steps of providing and entering, as defined in **Claim 23**, but fails to disclose that the call is of international origin. The Examiner, therefore, cites Wilson as disclosing a method of indicating whether the call is of international origin. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use the teaching of Wilson in the multi-media interface of Hulen. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions and conclusion.

Claim 23 has the same preamble as **Claim 35**. Therefore, Applicant's remarks regarding the preamble of **Claim 35** apply equally to the preamble of **Claim 23**. Accordingly, Hulen does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 23**.

For example, Hulen does not disclose or suggest providing an identification code identifying a mailbox associated with a subscriber through an identification code through an answerphone service. Hulen describes protocol processing, channel IDs and service IDs under control of the MMI CPU 48, but not an ID identifying a mailbox associated with a subscriber through an answerphone service.

Further, Hulen does not disclose or suggest entering either a first mode of answerphone operation or a second, different, mode of answerphone operation in dependence on information received during call establishment indicating whether the call is of international origin. Hulen's CPU identifies the appropriate DSPs/service ports for a particular host channel to perform one or more corresponding service protocols. The protocol-converting CPU does not enter a first mode of answerphone operation or a second, different, mode of answerphone. Further, the Examiner is correct that Hulen does not disclose differentiation if the call is of international origin.

Wilson discloses a voice services equipment that can be used, among other services, for international account calls. (Column 8, line 31.) The equipment identifies the country of origin of the call based on the Direct Dial In (DDI) digits, allowing different audio information to be provided for each originating country (e.g., messages the caller would hear may be in the language of the country of origin). (Column 8, lines 31-38.) Thus, in this "message announcement" mode of operation Wilson appears to direct callers to numerous different retrieval locations for information (e.g., for playback) based on the country of origin. The "message announcement" mode of operation, however, does not change, only the retrieval location changes. Therefore, Wilson does not disclose or suggest entering either a first mode of answerphone operation or a second, different, mode of answerphone operation in dependence on information received during call establishment indicating whether the call is of international origin.

In view of the foregoing discussion of Hulen and Wilson, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen and Wilson, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 23**. Among other differences, Hulen fails to teach a mailbox answerphone service, and Wilson fails to teach changing the mode of operation, as defined in **Claim 23**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen and Wilson do not justify a rejection of **Claim 23** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of **Claim 23**, and to pass **Claim 23** to allowance.

Because **Claims 24-34** depend from independent **Claim 23**, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that **Claims 24-34** are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons

Appl. No. : 09/555,951
Filed : September 5, 2000

expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other inventive features. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass **Claims 24-34** to allowance.

Further, even if Kennedy is combined with Hulen and Wilson, such a combination does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claims 23-34**. Kennedy relates to data messaging in a communications network, in which the messaging unit generates a data message in response to the occurrence of a reporting event. (Abstract) Kennedy emphasizes fraud protection. (Column 2, line 46.) Thus, Kennedy refers to unrelated technology because Kennedy does not relate to answerphone services.

Claims 36-37

The Examiner rejects dependent **Claims 36 and 37** as being unpatentable over Hulen in view of Wilson. **Claims 36 and 37** depend from independent **Claim 35**. Thus, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that **Claims 36-37** are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other inventive features. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass **Claims 36-37** to allowance.

Claims 38-41

The Examiner rejects independent **Claim 38** as being unpatentable over Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,333,973) in view of Venturini (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,317). Further, the Examiner rejects dependent **Claims 39 and 40** as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Venturini and in further view of Beyda (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,839). Also, the Examiner rejects dependent **Claim 41** as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Venturini and in further view of Hulen.

As to independent **Claim 38**, the Examiner asserts that Smith discloses a method of providing a mailbox answerphone service, as defined in **Claim 38**, except for allowing the caller to retrieve messages associated with a second identification code. The Examiner, therefore, cites Venturini as teaching allowing the user to input a second identification code and providing a message retrieve service to allow the caller to retrieve messages from the mailbox associated

with the second identification code. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use Venturini's teaching in the invention of Smith. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions and conclusion.

Smith discloses an integrated message center for a communications network. The integrated message center is a logical entity that resides in a mobile telephone and operates in conjunction with a network services provider to inform a user of incoming and pending messages, such as fax mail, e-mail, and voice mail. (Column 3, lines 48-54.) Further, the integrated message center provides for a scrollable list of notification headers. Each entry in the scrollable list identifies a received message and includes the sender's name and an identification icon identifying the type of message. The identification icons include, for example, icons used to identify voice mail, SMS messages, e-mail, and faxes. (Column 8, lines 40-45.)

Smith does not disclose or suggest detecting, if an indicator is not received, a first identification code associated with the mobile handset from information received during call establishment and providing a message retrieve service to allow the caller to retrieve messages from the mailbox associated with the first identification code. Instead, the user interacts with the voice mail server using the graphical controls shown in Figure 10. When the user presses one of the graphical controls, the mobile phone translates the user's action into corresponding DTMF tones to control the voice mail server. Thus, Smith requires the user to interact with the voice mail server by pressing one of the graphical controls. This, however, is not during call establishment, as recited in **Claim 38**, but rather at a subsequent time.

Because of the required pressing of graphical symbols during a call, Smith teaches a concept that is substantially different from the method of **Claim 38**. Accordingly, the Examiner is correct that Smith does not teach allowing the caller to retrieve messages associated with a second identification code.

Venturini discloses a method of retrieving messages from a voice mailbox in response to a message waiting indicator. To retrieve a message, the user is required to depress key 22b2, and the user terminal 10 determines the network with which the mobile terminal 10 is registered, thereafter recognizes that the user wishes to retrieve the messages stored in the voice mailbox of the network indicated by the NRI information. The mobile terminal 10 then automatically dials

Appl. No. : 09/555,951
Filed : September 5, 2000

the prestored access code for the voice mailbox of the network indicated by the NRI information (block H1). (Column 8, lines 19-28.) Thus, similar to Smith, Venturini teaches that the user must request (i.e., depress a key) retrieval of a message which then occurs automatically. Venturini does not require the user to input a selection indicator and an identification code.

In view of the foregoing discussion of Smith and Venturini, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith and Venturini, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 38**. More particularly, Venturini's automatic message retrieval upon depressing a key does not lead to the method of **Claim 38** when combined with Smith's translation of user action into corresponding DTMF tones. Even such a combination does not teach input of a selection indicator and an identification code. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith and Venturini do not justify a rejection of **Claim 38** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of **Claim 38**, and to pass **Claim 38** to allowance.

Because **Claims 39-41** depend from independent **Claim 38**, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that **Claims 39-41** are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other inventive features. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass **Claims 39-41** to allowance.

Further, even if Beyda is combined with Smith and Venturini, such a combination does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claims 39-41**. Beyda relates to a system for automatically notifying a user of an awaiting message. (Abstract) In Beyda, the user can interact with the present system by calling a special telephone number or by entering a code into the cellular telephone to disable the system or change the parameters of the system. (Column 3, lines 58-62.). Beyda does not address an identification code corresponding to a different subscriber. Instead, the parameter changes are for the current user, not for another subscriber. Thus, Beyda does not teach features that would render the claims obvious over a combination of Smith, Venturini and Beyda.

Claim 42

The Examiner rejects independent **Claim 42** as being unpatentable over Hulen in view of Wilson. It is Applicants' understanding that the Examiner asserts that Hulen discloses a voice processing system as defined in **Claim 42**, except for a second, different, mode of answerphone operation in dependence on information received during call establishment indicating whether the call is of international origin. (If this understanding is not correct, Applicants respectfully request clarification.) The Examiner, therefore, cites Wilson as disclosing a second, different, mode of answerphone operation in dependence on information received during call establishment indicating whether the call is of international origin. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use Wilson's indication of whether the call is of international origin in the interface of Hulen. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions and conclusion.

As discussed above with reference to **Claim 35**, Hulen does not teach a mailbox answerphone service. Instead, Hulen discloses a multi-media interface for protocol conversions corresponding to various types of telecommunications media.

For example, Hulen does not disclose or suggest identification of a mailbox associated with a subscriber by way of an identification code processed through an answerphone service. Hulen describes protocol processing, channel IDs and service IDs under control of the MMI CPU 48, but not an ID identifying a mailbox associated with a subscriber through an answerphone service.

Further, Hulen does not disclose or suggest entering either a first mode of answerphone operation or a second, different, mode of answerphone operation in dependence on information received during call establishment indicating whether the call is of international origin. Hulen's CPU identifies the appropriate DSPs/service ports for a particular host channel to perform one or more corresponding service protocols. The protocol-converting CPU does not enter a first mode of answerphone operation or a second, different, mode of answerphone. Further, the Examiner is correct that Hulen does not disclose differentiation if the call is of international origin.

Wilson discloses a voice services equipment that can be used, among other services, for international account calls. (Column 8, line 31.) The equipment identifies the country of origin

of the call based on the Direct Dial In (DDI) digits, allowing different audio information to be provided for each originating country (e.g., messages the caller would hear may be in the language of the country of origin). (Column 8, lines 31-38.) Thus, in this "message announcement" mode of operation Wilson appears to direct callers to numerous different retrieval locations for information (e.g., for playback) based on the country of origin. The "message announcement" mode of operation, however, does not change, only the retrieval location changes. Therefore, Wilson does not disclose or suggest entering either a first mode of answerphone operation or a second, different, mode of answerphone operation in dependence on information received during call establishment indicating whether the call is of international origin.

In view of the foregoing discussion of Hulen and Wilson, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen and Wilson, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 42**. Among other differences, Hulen fails to teach a mailbox answerphone service, and Wilson fails to teach changing the mode of operation, as defined in **Claim 42**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen and Wilson do not justify a rejection of **Claim 42** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of **Claim 42**, and to pass **Claim 42** to allowance.

Claim 43

The Examiner rejects independent **Claim 43** as being unpatentable over Hulen in view of Venturini. The Examiner asserts that Hulen discloses an apparatus for use in a mobile communications system, as defined in **Claim 43**, except for allowing the caller to retrieve messages associated with a second identification number. The Examiner, therefore, cites Venturini as teaching an apparatus that is adapted to identify a second subscriber, on receipt of a request from the second subscriber during the call, by way of other information supplied by the second subscriber during the call. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use Venturini's teaching in the invention of Smith. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions and conclusion.

As to Hulen, it appears the Examiner equates the apparatus defined in **Claim 43** to the MMI 12 shown, for example, in Hulen's Figure 1. The MMI performs protocol conversions, but is not an apparatus adapted to store messages for subsequent retrieval by a subscriber. The MMI interfaces the telephone network and a host messaging center 14 that supports messaging applications, such as voice mail. (Column 2, lines 7-14.) Hulen, however, does not describe details of the host messaging center (cf., rejection of **Claim 35**, supra.)

As Hulen fails to disclose details of the host messaging center, Applicants submit that Hulen fails to disclose an apparatus adapted to identify a first subscriber making a call to retrieve a message by means of an identification signal automatically forwarded to the apparatus during call establishment, wherein the signal identifying the equipment is used by the subscriber. Applicants, therefore, respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that that Hulen discloses these limitations of **Claim 43**.

Venturini discloses a method of retrieving messages from a voice mailbox in response to a message waiting indicator. To retrieve a message, the user is required to depress key 22b2, and the user terminal 10 determines the network with which the mobile terminal 10 is registered, thereafter recognizes that the user wishes to retrieve the messages stored in the voice mailbox of the network indicated by the NRI information. The mobile terminal 10 then automatically dials the prestored access code for the voice mailbox of the network indicated by the NRI information (block H1). (Column 8, lines 19-28.) Thus, Venturini teaches that the user must request (i.e., depress a key) retrieval of a message which then occurs automatically. Venturini does not require the user to supply any information other than depressing the key.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Venturini fails to disclose or suggest an apparatus adapted to identify a second subscriber, on receipt of a request from the second subscriber during the call, by way of other information supplied by the second subscriber during the call, as recited in **Claim 43**.

In view of the foregoing discussion of Hulen and Venturini, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen and Venturini, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 43**. More particularly, Venturini's automatic message retrieval upon depressing a key does not lead to the method of **Claim 43** when combined with Hulen's

Appl. No. : 09/555,951
Filed : September 5, 2000

protocol converting MMI. Even such a combination, for example, does not teach that a second subscriber supplies other information during the call. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hulen and Venturini do not justify a rejection of **Claim 43** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of **Claim 43**, and to pass **Claim 43** to allowance.

Claim 44

The Examiner rejects independent **Claim 44** as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Venturini. The Examiner asserts that Smith discloses an apparatus for use in a mobile communications system, as defined in **Claim 44**, except for allowing the caller to retrieve messages associated with a second identification number. The Examiner, therefore, cites Venturini as teaching a receipt of a number of identification codes each being associated with a different mobile subscriber, wherein the apparatus is arranged to select one of the mobile subscribers and/or to select one of a plurality of predetermined responses if the response selection indicator is received, and otherwise to automatically provide a particular response relating to one of the mobile subscribers. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use Venturini's teaching in the invention of Smith. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions and conclusion.

Smith discloses an integrated message center for a communications network. The integrated message center is a logical entity that resides in a mobile telephone and operates in conjunction with a network services provider to inform a user of incoming and pending messages, such as fax mail, e-mail, and voice mail. (Column 3, lines 48-54.) Further, the integrated message center provides for a scrollable list of notification headers. (Column 8, lines 36-40.) Each entry in the scrollable list identifies a received message and includes the sender's name and an identification icon identifying the type of message. The identification icons include, for example, icons used to identify voice mail, SMS messages, e-mail, and faxes. (Column 8, lines 40-45.)

Smith's message center does not disclose or suggest, for example, an apparatus that is responsive during the call to receipt of a number of identification codes each being associated

with a different mobile subscriber, wherein the apparatus is arranged to select one of the mobile subscribers and/or to select one of a plurality of predetermined responses if the response selection indicator is received, and otherwise to automatically provide a particular response relating to one of the mobile subscribers. Venturini also fails to disclose or to suggest these limitations recited in **Claim 44**.

Venturini discloses a method of retrieving messages from a voice mailbox in response to a message waiting indicator. To retrieve a message, the user is required to depress key 22b2, and the user terminal 10 determines the network with which the mobile terminal 10 is registered, thereafter recognizes that the user wishes to retrieve the messages stored in the voice mailbox of the network indicated by the NRI information. The mobile terminal 10 then automatically dials the prestored access code for the voice mailbox of the network indicated by the NRI information (block H1). (Column 8, lines 19-28.) Thus, similar to Smith, Venturini teaches a single user's retrieval of a stored message. Venturini and Smith do not disclose or suggest a number of identification codes each being associated with a different mobile subscriber.

In view of the foregoing discussion of Smith and Venturini, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith and Venturini, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to suggest each and every limitation recited in **Claim 44**. More particularly, Venturini's automatic message retrieval upon a single user depressing a key does not lead to the method of **Claim 44** when combined with Smith's translation of a single user's action into corresponding DTMF tones. Even such a combination does not teach multiple identification codes, as defined in **Claim 44**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith and Venturini do not justify a rejection of **Claim 44** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of **Claim 44**, and to pass **Claim 44** to allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested.

Appl. No. : 09/555,951
Filed : September 5, 2000

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/22/02

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

H:\DOCS\MOH\MOH-8487.DOC:ad
111102